

**Daniel Berko - SBN 94912**  
**LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL BERKO**  
**819 Eddy Street**  
**San Francisco, CA 94109**  
**Telephone: 415-771-6174**  
**Facsimile: 415-474-3748**  
**E-mail: BerkoLaw@SBCglobal.net**

**Attorneys for Plaintiffs,**  
**DANIEL KEATING-TRAYNOR on behalf of himself**  
**and all others similarly situated**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

<b>DANIEL KEATING-TRAYNOR on</b>	)	<b>CASE NO: CV-08-3035-EDL</b>
<b>behalf of himself and all others similarly</b>	)	
<b>situated,</b>	)	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO</b>
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	<b>CONSIDER WHETHER CASES</b>
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>SHOULD BE RELATED</b>
	)	
<b>AC SQUARE, COMCAST INC.;</b>	)	
<b>AFSHIN GHANEH; ANDREW</b>	)	
<b>BAHMANYAR; and DOES 1</b>	)	
<b>THROUGH 60, inclusive,</b>	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

TO EACH PARTY AND TO THE COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR EACH PARTY:

Plaintiff hereby gives notice, as required in Civil Local Rule 3-12(b), of the following case related to this action:


1. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA; DANIEL KEATING-TRAYNOR vs AC SQUARE et al; with case number **CV-08-02907-MHP** filed on Federal Court on June 11, 2008

These cases are related because they discuss the same claims of unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business practices against the same Defendants.

1 The same Plaintiff DANNY KEATING-TRAYNOR, was in both cases, an employee for  
2 Defendant AC SQUARE.

3 Counsel opines that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or  
4 conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.

5  
6 Date: June 25, 2008

7   
8 Daniel Berko,  
9 Attorney for Plaintiff Daniel Keating-Traynor in  
10 behalf of himself and all other similarly situated.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DANIEL KEATING-TRAYNOR vs AC SQUARE CV-08-03035-EDL  
District Court for the Northern District of California

### PROOF OF SERVICE

I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is 819 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94109. On **Jun 25, 2008** I served a true copy of the following document(s):

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED**

- ☐ By transmitting **via facsimile** the document(s) listed above to the fax number(s) set forth below on this date before 5:00 p.m.
- ☐ By causing to be **personally delivered** the documents listed above by a messenger service, at the addresses set forth below on this date.
- ☐ By placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope, at a station designated for collection and processing of envelopes and packages for **overnight delivery** on next business day, addressed as set forth below.
- ☒ By placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in **United States mail** at San Francisco, California, addressed as set forth below.

<p><b>Ronal A. Peters</b>  <b>Littler Mendelson</b>  <b>50 West San Fernando St. 15th Floor</b>  <b>San Jose, CA 94113-2303</b></p>	<p><b>COMCAST, INC.</b>  <b>An. Andrew C. Topping</b>  <b>1701 John F. Kennedy Blvd.</b>  <b>15th Floor (Legal Department)</b>  <b>Philadelphia, PA 19103</b></p>

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on **Jun 25, 2008** at San Francisco, California.

  
Carlos Jato

PROOF OF SERVICE